

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 5 -

Art Unit: 2697

Claim 18 (original) An apparatus according to claim 17, further comprising:
a wireless interface adapted to communicate with the wireless device in response to
selection of the link included in the pushed alerts.

Claim 19 (original) An apparatus according to claim 17, wherein the first message feed
comprises one of a voice mail, fax mail, email, and an information source, and the second
message feed comprises a different one of the voice mail, fax mail, email, and the information
source.

Claim 20 (Cancelled).

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable
over Bobo (U.S. Patent 6,564,321) in view of Gustaffsson (U.S. Patent 6,424,841).

Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct over Bobo in combination with Gustaffsson,
the combination of which neither describing nor suggesting limitations of claim 1, which recites:
“...A method for managing message events associated with a plurality of message feeds provided
to a user in a communication system, the method comprising the steps of *collecting information*
regarding at least two message events associated with the message feeds, updating a list of
messages for the user based on the collected information; preparing an alert based on the updated
list of messages; pushing the alert to a wireless device associated with the user using a Wireless
Access Protocol (WAP) push protocol, *the alert including an indication of the most recent*
message event of the at least two message events; and archiving information associated with the
updated list of messages...”

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 6 -

Art Unit: 2697

In contrast to the step of 'collecting information regarding a plurality of message events', Bobo describes, at col. 9, lines 20-25, in part:

"... When a new message is received at step 54 ... the user's mailbox is updated to display the total number and types of messages Additionally, the MSDS 10 sends an e-mail message to the user's computer 32 to inform the user of the newly arrived message..."

Thus, Bobo informs the user at each receipt of a message, rather than collecting a number of messages before forwarding the messages to the user, as recited in the current claims. In addition, with the collection of messages the present invention also forwards 'an indication of the most recent message event of the collection...' Because Bobo neither describes nor suggests forwarding a collection, no indication is provided of the most recent in the collection, as recited in the claims.

Similarly, Gustafsson discloses generally the forwarding of one message. (see columns 8 and 9). Applicants can find no suggestion or teaching in Gustafsson of the limitations of "...steps of .collecting information regarding at least two message events associated with the message feeds, updating a list of messages for the user based on the collected information; preparing an alert based on the updated list of messages; pushing the alert to a wireless device associated with the user using a Wireless Access Protocol (WAP) push protocol, the alert including an indication of the most recent message event of the at least two message events..." as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, no description or suggestion of the limitations of the claims is found in Bobo and Gustafsson, either alone or in combination. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentably distinct over the combination of references, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Independent claims 9 and 17 also include limitations similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, and are

AMN120.058(3)

Serial No. 09/753,345

- 7 -

Art Unit: 2697

therefore patentable for at least the reason put forth above with regard to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-20 serve to further limit their parent independent claims and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Lindsay McGuinness, Applicants' Attorney at so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

1/21/2004
Date

Lindsay McGuinness
Lindsay McGuinness, Reg. No. 38,549
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
30 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 061473/0269982 120-058
dd: 11/21/2003

AMN120.058(3)